

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Specification

Page 1 to 3 of the specification has been amended to update the list of co-pending applications with USPTO patent numbers.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 103

In view of the Examiner's objections to the claims we have revised that claims 1 and 20 to include the features of previously dependent claim 17. We respectfully submit that this combination of features is now novel and inventive over the cited prior art.

In particular, we note that the Examiner has objected to claim 17 on the basis of Hartstein, indicating that Figure 2A of Hartstein discloses the claimed printer arrangement. We respectfully submit that this is not the case.

In particular, Figure 2A of Hartstein shows a refrigerator 20, which as set out in column 2, line 32 onwards, includes a computer system supported on the exterior surface 24 of the refrigerator door. The computer system is implemented by the presence of a first compartment 32 and a keyboard 34 as shown. It is notable that, the entire description of Hartstein identifies the printer by reference numeral 42, but that in the arrangement of Figure 2A there is not shown any printer 42, or any reference numeral or other representation equivalent to a printer, which is in contrast to the example of Figure 1.

Thus, there is nothing to teach or suggest that the embodiment of Figure 2A would include a printer and as this is explicitly not shown, it is evident from this that the embodiment of Figure 2A is not intended to incorporate a printer.

Even in the event that a printer were incorporated in the embodiment of Figure 2A, for example if it were to form part of the compartment 32, there is nothing to suggest that the claimed arrangement in the printer module is provided in the door of upper storage compartment, with the door of the lower storage compartment providing a collector arranged to receive the printed document.

In this regard, it is notable Hartstein does not at any stage describe a collector arranged to receive a printed document. Furthermore, it is evident that in all the arrangement of Hartstein, all the components are provided in a single door and are not distributed between two doors, as now claimed.

We also note that none of the other cited prior art teaches or suggests the use of a collector or the arrangement as claimed.

We therefore respectfully submit that the revised claims are novel and inventive.

Finally, in view of the fact that these features were previously contained in dependent claim 17 we respectfully submit that this does not introduce new matters for consideration by the Examiner and that therefore the application should now proceed to grant.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762